

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated April 1, 2010, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on July 1, 2010. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 13, 26, 28 and 29 have been amended and new claims 30-32 have been added to more clearly recite various aspects of the invention. Support for the amendments and the new claims may be found throughout the specification, including paragraphs [0021]-[0022] and [0026]-[0027] and Figures 1-4. Applicants believe no new matter has been introduced by the amendments and the new claims presented herein. The amendments and the new claims have been made to put the claims in condition for allowance or in better condition for an appeal. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for changing the inventorship of this application under Rule 48. Applicants would also like to thank the Examiner for withdrawing the § 112 rejection in view of the previously filed remarks and amendments.

Claims 1-2, 6 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Publication No. 2004/0252585 ("Smith"). Claim 1 has been amended to now include "a recording vehicle for collecting seismic data," "wherein the data collection system is stored on the recording vehicle" and "a first router directly coupled to a second router." Support for the amendment may be found throughout the specification, including paragraphs [0021]-[0022] and Figures 1 and 4. Applicants respectfully submit that this limitation is not taught by Smith.

Smith is generally directed at a high capacity digital geophone system capable of distributing seismic data over a computer network. (See Smith, Abstract). However, Smith does not teach "a recording vehicle for collecting seismic data" or "wherein the data collection system is stored on the recording vehicle," as newly recited in claim 1. In contrast, Smith merely describes a network architecture for the dissemination of digitized, localized and time-stamped seismic data from its origin to a destination processing device for storage and analysis. (See Smith, paragraphs [0015]-[0016]). Smith's network architecture, however, is not on or part of a recording vehicle. In fact,

Smith never mentions a recording vehicle, let alone a recording vehicle with a data collection system anywhere in its disclosure.

In the Response to Office Action filed December 22, 2009, Applicants argued that Smith did not teach a first router coupled to a second router. In response to this argument, the Examiner explained that Applicants did not claim how the first router must be coupled to the second router and that Smith connects multiple routers to the same network thereby coupling routers. (See Office Action, pages 2-3). Claim 1 has now been amended to describe how the first router is coupled to the second router. In particular, claim 1 now includes wherein the first router is coupled to the second router via a single connection. Smith does not teach this limitation. In contrast, as the Examiner admits in the office action, Smith's routers are coupled to each other via a TCP/IP Network. (See Smith, Figure 1, #16). Coupling routers to each other via a TCP/IP Network, however, is not the same as coupling routers via a single connection.

For these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Smith. Claims 2, 6 and 10 are also patentable over Smith since they depend from claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 5 and 27 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Eos. Trans. AGU Fall Meeting, 2001 ("Johnson"). Neither Smith nor Johnson, alone or in combination, teaches or discloses "a recording vehicle for collecting seismic data," "wherein the data collection system is stored on the recording vehicle," or "wherein the first router is coupled to the second router via a single connection," as recited in claim 1. Since claims 3, 5 and 27 depend from claim 1, and since neither Smith nor Johnson, alone or in combination, teaches, discloses or suggests all the limitations of claim 1, claims 3, 5 and 27 are therefore also patentable over Smith and Johnson. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of US Patent Application No. 2002/0071430 ("Szyszko"). Neither Smith nor Szyszko, alone or in combination, teaches or discloses "a recording vehicle for collecting seismic data," "wherein the data collection system is stored on the recording vehicle," or "wherein the first router is coupled to the second router via a single connection," as recited in claim 1. Since claim 4 depends from claim 1, and since

neither Smith nor Szyszko, alone or in combination, teaches, discloses or suggests all the limitations of claim 1, claim 4 is therefore also patentable over Smith and Szyszko. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,131,119 ("Fukui"). Neither Smith nor Fukui, alone or in combination, teaches or discloses "a recording vehicle for collecting seismic data," "wherein the data collection system is stored on the recording vehicle," or "wherein the first router is coupled to the second router via a single connection," as recited in claim 1. Since claim 13 depends from claim 1, and since neither Smith nor Fukui, alone or in combination, teaches, discloses or suggests all the limitations of claim 1, claim 13 is therefore also patentable over Smith and Fukui. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 7-8 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,885,724 ("Read"). Neither Smith nor Read, alone or in combination, teaches or discloses "a recording vehicle for collecting seismic data," "wherein the data collection system is stored on the recording vehicle," or "wherein the first router is coupled to the second router via a single connection," as recited in claim 1. Since claims 7-8 depend from claim 1, and since neither Smith nor Read, alone or in combination, teaches, discloses or suggests all the limitations of claim 1, claims 7-8 are therefore also patentable over Smith and Read. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 28, 12, 15, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Fukui and further in view of Embedded Linux in a Soft Real-Time Task: The Canadian Geological Survey Internet Seismometer ("Arescon"). Neither Smith nor Fukui nor Arescon, alone or in combination, teaches or discloses "a recording vehicle for collecting seismic data," "wherein the data collection system is stored on the recording vehicle," or "wherein the first router is coupled to the second router via a single connection," as recited in claim 1. Since claims 28, 12, 15, 16 and 17 depend from claim 1, and since neither Smith nor Fukui nor Arescon, alone or in combination, teaches, discloses or suggests all the limitations of claim 1, claims

28, 12, 15, 16 and 17 are therefore also patentable over Smith, Fukui and Arescon. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 26 and 29 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith in view of Eos. Trans. AGU Fall Meeting, 2001 (“Johnson”). Claim 26 has been amended to now include “a recording vehicle for collecting seismic data” and “wherein the first data collection system is stored on the recording vehicle.” Support for the amendment may be found throughout the specification, including paragraphs [0021]-[0022] and Figures 1 and 4. Neither Smith nor Johnson, alone or in combination, teaches or discloses “a recording vehicle for collecting seismic data” or “wherein the data collection system is stored on the recording vehicle,” as recited in claim 26. Therefore, claim 26 is patentable over Smith and Johnson. Since claim 29 depends from claim 26, and since neither Smith nor Johnson, alone or in combination, teaches, discloses or suggests all the limitations of claim 26, claim 29 is therefore also patentable over Smith and Johnson. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Further, claim 29 has been amended to now include “wherein the first router is coupled to the second router via a single connection” and “wherein the first router communicates with the second router to determine a best path to route the seismic data based on dynamic routing and load balancing techniques.” Support for the amendment may be found throughout the specification, including paragraphs [0026]-[0027] and Figures 1 and 4. Neither Smith nor Johnson, alone or in combination, teaches or discloses “wherein the first router is coupled to the second router via a single connection.” Additionally, neither Smith nor Johnson, alone or in combination, teaches or discloses “wherein the first router communicates with the second router to determine a best path to route the seismic data based on dynamic routing and load balancing techniques.” Therefore, claim 29 is further patentable over Smith and Johnson. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New claims 30-32 have been added to more clearly recite various aspects of the invention. Support for the new claims may be found throughout the specification, including paragraphs [0021]-[0022] and [0026]-[0027] and Figures 1 and 4. With regard to new claims 30-32, Applicants submit that claims 30-32 recite subject matter that is neither disclosed, taught, nor otherwise suggested by the cited references, and as such,

allowance of these claims is respectfully requested. In particular, Smith fails to teach “wherein a first seismic data source of the portion of the plurality of data sources is coupled to one of the plurality of data source nodes and to a second seismic data source of the portion of the plurality of data sources, and wherein the second seismic data source is coupled to the first seismic data source of the portion of the plurality of data sources and a third seismic data source of the portion of the plurality of data sources,” as recited in claims 30 and 32. In contrast, Smith merely teaches coupling a single seismic data source (i.e., #10-GP) to one of the plurality of data source nodes (i.e., #14-HUB). (See Smith, Figure 1). In fact, Smith only teaches data sources that only connect with a data source node (i.e., #14 HUB). In this manner, Smith does not teach the first and second seismic data source, as recited in claims 1 and 26, because Smith’s data sources are not connected to another seismic data source.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 13, 26, 28 and 29 have been amended to replace “seismic data sources” with “data sources” for clarity .

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, neither alone nor in combination, teach, show, or suggest the claimed invention. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

The prior art made of record is noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicants’ disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, it is believed that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not deemed necessary for a full and complete response to this office action. Accordingly, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ari Pramudji/ Date: June 1, 2010

Ari Pramudji  
Registration No. 45,022  
Pramudji Law Group, PLLC  
1800 Bering, Suite 540  
Houston, Texas 77057

**PATENT**

Atty. Dkt. No. 14.0209-PCT-US (WGEC0106)

Telephone: (713) 468-4600  
Facsimile: (713) 980-9882  
Attorney for Assignee